

DEFENCE OF THE ESSAY

For a REVIEW of the
Book of **COMMON PRAYER**,
So far as relates to the ATHANASIAN CREED.
In ANSWER to a LETTER in the
Weekly Miscellany of Octob. 19th last.

WHEREIN

Every Argument made use of by the *Letter-Writer*, is fairly Considered, and clearly Refuted. And that the **NICENE CREED** is sufficient to secure the Christian Faith from all Heresies, especially the *Arian*, is fully demonstrated from **ATHANASIUS** himself.

By the AUTHOR *of the* **ESSAY**.

SOFTER WORDS might have done as well, and have never hurt the ARGUMENT, *if it be any*. The World will easily see the Difference between Reasoning and Railing.

Dr. WATERLAND's Supplement to the Case of Arian Subscription, pag. 41.

Let the Things which were confessed by the **NICENE** Council prevail; for they are *right*, and *sufficient* to overturn all the most wicked Heresies, but especially the *Arian*.

St. ATHANASIUS's Words, cited by Bp. BEVERIDGE in his Exposit. on the xxxix Articles, 3d Edit. p. 181.

L O N D O N:

Printed for T. COOPER, at the *Globe* in *Ivy-Lane*, near *Pater-noster Row*. And Sold by J. BRINDLY, in *New Bond-street*; J. STAGG, in *Westminster Hall*; E. NUTT, at the *Royal Exchange*; and A. DODD, at the *Peacock* near *Temple-Bar*. 1734.
[Price Six-pence.]

DEFEINCE

OF THE

ESSAYS

FOR A REVIEW OF THE

BOOK OF COMMON PRAYER

AS FOR AS RELATED TO THE ATHANASIAN CRED.

IN ANSWER TO A LETTER IN THE

STOCKS MISCELLANY OF OCTOBER 19th 1841.

W. L. E. T. I. N.

Every Argument made use of by the Author of the
Book of Common Prayer, and every Argument made use of
in the Creed, is brought to light, and every Argument
made use of in the Creed, is brought to light, and every
Argument made use of in the Creed, is brought to light.

By the Author of the ESSAYS.

Printed by W. L. E. T. I. N. at No. 1, Pall Mall East.
The Author's name is not printed on the title page.
The Author's name is not printed on the title page.
The Author's name is not printed on the title page.
The Author's name is not printed on the title page.
The Author's name is not printed on the title page.

L O V D O N.

Printed by T. Cooper, at the Office in the Strand.
The Author's name is not printed on the title page.
The Author's name is not printed on the title page.
The Author's name is not printed on the title page.
The Author's name is not printed on the title page.



A
DEFENCE
OF THE
ESSAY

For a REVIEW of the

Book of COMMON PRAYER.



MY Intention in writing an *ESSAY for a Review of the Book of COMMON PRAYER*, if my Word can be taken for it, was with a Design to do Service to Religion in general, the Church of *England* in particular: And that an Undertaking so apparently advantageous to Both, might appear in a stronger and more convincing Light, it therefore was, that I expressed such Reasons and Arguments, as might be necessary on the Occasion, in the Words of the most Orthodox, and Eminent Writers of our Church; more especially where any material Alterations were recommended: And the

2 A DEFENCE of the ESSAY

Whole I submitted to the Consideration of *Those in Authority*; without whose Concurrence it could avail nothing.

BY a Method so just and reasonable, so decent and respectful, I thought at least to have secured my self from Slander and Reproach, Controversy and Dispute, whether the Design itself might be well or ill esteemed; as being either unnecessary, or not well timed. And as this was done with Christian Views, it was no less endeavoured to be performed after a Rational and Christian Manner, without Censure, Reflection, or Abuse. Indeed, some Expressions therein may be thought severe against the Priests and Jesuits; and which were used, more to expose their known Arts and Stratagems, for defeating, if possible, the Attempts of any Reformation; (which was the immediate Design of the *Essay* to recommend) than out of Ill-will to their Persons: and for this only, I little expected to have been represented, as a Friend to, much less one of them.

BUT by a Letter in Mr. HOOKER'S *WEEKLY MISCELLANY*, of the 19th of *October*, I find my self mistaken in every Part; for I am not only drawn thereby into a Paper Controversy; but also much traduced, slandered, and abused; nay, rendred suspicious of being a *Papist*, tho' for no other Reason assigned by the Author, than my often suggesting, that the *Papists* would oppose my Scheme of Reformation. Let the judicious Reader judge, if that is a sufficient Reason to prove me one.

IN this charitable Letter, I am thus represented; "A Man of smooth Art, great Guile, and treacherous Iniquity; my Honesty even questioned." In one part, acquitted from being an Arian, or Socinian, "as receiving the Nicene Creed, and the first four Petitions of our Litany;

tany;” and yet within ten Lines after, “much questioned, as to the Orthodoxy of my Faith, and to compleat my Character, I must be a Deist, Antitrinitarian, or Papist:” For if any Part of the *Essay* was writ to gratify either, as the *Letter-Writer* insinuates, I could scarce do it, without being one or other of them. But for some Reasons yet unknown, he would chiefly persuade the Reader, that I am a Papist. Had he informed the Publick, what Colour of Reason he had for it, I would have thanked him.

THESE severe Charges, and heavy Accusations, I have selected, that my Reader may have at one View, the Manner in which this Orthodox Writer (perhaps Divine) has treated me: Whether, any thing offered by me in the *Essay*, has given Occasion for such Treatment, or can any way justify him therein, I am very willing to leave to the Determination of every candid Reader, who yet has, or from this extraordinary Representation thereof, dares venture, either to peruse the *ESSAY*, or this *DEFENCE* of it; and if nothing will be there found, to give Countenance thereto, What must the Author think of his own Conduct, for such an unprovoked Treatment? Allegations unsupported, foreign also to the Point in Debate, could no way tend to demonstrate the Truth of what he thought necessary to espouse; such a Method, may please and succeed with the Weak and Credulous, but can never be approved of, or agreeable to, the Wise, Judicious, and Discerning.

IT may therefore be necessary, to inform the Reader, what gave Occasion to my Author's Reflections, before I reply to what he has offered, as to the chief Matter in Dispute; and here it must be observed, that the *Letter-Writer* expresses no Dislike of the *Design* in general recommended by me, but rather approves thereof;

4 A DEFENCE of the ESSAY

for he is pleased to say, " I talk often and well, for having a Liturgy, plain, easy, and intelligible ; " nor does he appear any way displeased with the Specimen of Prayers, except the Collect for Trinity Sunday ; for if he had, no doubt we should have heard of it. What only offends him is, my proposing the *Athanasian Creed* to be *totally rejected*, or *less frequently used*, and the fore-mentioned *Collect* ; both which shall be fully considered : As to the Creed, I offered two Reasons, in the Words and Expressions of the most orthodox and eminent Divines of our Church, for the Disuse of it ; what I said of my self concerning the *Creed* and *Trinity*, may be proper to recite for the Reader's Satisfaction, to whom my Appeal is made, to judge between us : my Words are these ; * " As the *Athanasian* " *Creed* has been the Occasion of great Strife and Con- " tention, and of very uncharitable Disputes among " Christians, it is submitted, whether it would not be " an Instance of great Wisdom, Prudence, and Charity, " in our Governors, was it left entirely out of the " Book, or its use confined to Cathedral Churches only, " or left to the Minister's Discretion, as some Hymns " and Prayers are ; and in the room thereof, to read " either the *Nicene*, or Apostles Creed ; for the Trinity " being allowed by all to be a Mystery, in the Nature " of the thing, it cannot be capable of a clear, certain, " and defined *Explication*, as to the Metaphysical Es- " sence, Substance, and Property of each Person in the " Godhead ; and yet it is attempted to be done in that " Creed, tho' little to the Satisfaction of many Learned " and Pious Persons.

" MY Reasons for exchanging that Creed for one " of the other, are :

First,

* ESSAY, pag. 40, 41.

" *First*, BECAUSE many Sound and Orthodox Christians of our Church, both Clergy and Laity, have been greatly dissatisfied with it.

" *Secondly*, IN regard the true Faith will be equally secured and preserved among us, by the Use of the *Nicene*, or Apostles Creed; either of which contains the Sum, Substance, and Fundamental Articles of the Christian Faith; as I shall presently evince, from the best Authorities." These are the Words I used, the only Words that can give Offence.

I immediately produced the Testimonies of Mr. CHILLINGWORTH, Bishop TAYLOR, Archbishop TILLOTSON, and Dr. CAVE, in their own Words, in proof of my first Argument; whereby it appeared, * that Mr. CHILLINGWORTH disliked it, " for being *false, presumptuous, and schismatical*, on account of the *damning Sentences*, and therefore repugnant to the Word of God. That Bishop TAYLOR thought it " *contrary to natural Reason*; " that the Scriptures said Little of those Curiousities of Explication; " that to put Uncharitableness into the Creed, and so make it an Article of Faith, perhaps no Faith of ATHANASIUS, was what seemed very hard to him." That Archbishop TILLOTSON " was no way *satisfied* with it, and wished we were *well rid* of it." And that Dr. CAVE observed, " that the Difficulties in this Creed, which was not received in the Church till the Year 1000. did, to many learned and considerate Men, seem very great.

IN support of my second Argument, I demonstrated by Quotations taken from our most eminent modern Divines, viz. Mr. CHILLINGWORTH, Bishop TAYLOR, Bishop PEARSON, his present Grace of Canterbury, Bishop BEVERIDGE, Dr. HOLE, Mr. OSTERVALL, Dr.

6 A DEFENCE of the ESSAY

DR. BENNET, and the late Lord Chancellor * KING ;
that the Apostles Creed did contain the Sum and Sub-
stance of the Christian Faith.

AND my Observation from thence was, in these
Words ; “ That therefore the *Apostles Creed* contains
“ the necessary Articles of Faith, I hope is fully demon-
“ strated, beyond the Possibility of Cavil or Denial. And
“ to prove a Point so essential to my Argument as that
“ is, in order to have ATHANASIUS’s Creed *exchanged*
“ for the Apostles or *Nicene*, will to the curious, serious,
“ and

* Permit me, by way of Supplement, to add from the An-
cients a few more Testimonies, out of this Great Man’s *Criti-
cal History of the Creed*, pag. 4, 5.

‘ St. AUSTIN calls it, “ the Illumination of the Soul, the
“ Perfection of Believers, by which the Bond of *Infidelity* is
“ *dissolved*, the Gate of Life is opened, and the Glory of Faith
“ is shewn : Little indeed in Words, but great in Mysteries ;
“ short, so as not to oppress the Memory ; yet comprehensive,
“ so as to exceed the Understanding. Worthily therefore is
“ this Creed to be attended unto, since *whatsoever is prefigured*
“ *in the Patriarchs, declared in the Scriptures, or foretold in the*
“ *Prophets, concerning the Blessed Trinity, and the Mystery of our*
“ *Saviour’s Incarnation, Death and Crucifixion, is contained in it.*

‘ J. CASSIAN writes, “ that the *Creed* comprehends in it-
“ self, in few Words, the *Faith* of both *Testaments*, and the
“ *Sense* of the *whole Scriptures*.” PETRUS CHRYSOLOGUS,
“ that it is the Entrance into Life, the Gate of Salvation, a
“ *peculiar, innocent, and pure Confession* ; the Covenant of Life,
“ the Plea of Salvation, and the indissoluble Sacrament of Faith
“ between God and Man.

‘ MAXIMUS TAURINENSIS calls it, “ a Symbol, by the
“ Sign of which the *Faithful* are *separated* from the *Unbeliev-
“ ing* ; whose *Truth* makes every *Believer* of it a *Christian*.”
‘ And by IRENEUS, TERTULLIAN, NOVATIAN, and JE-
‘ ROM, it is called “ the *Rule of Faith and Truth*.”

for a Review of the COMMON PRAYER. 9

“and impartial, be a sufficient Excuse for enlarging so particularly.

THE Reader will observe, that the total Disuse of the *Athanasian Creed*, is more recommended by me, than the less occasional Use thereof.

I will now, for the Reader's Information, transcribe as fully what the *Letter-Writer* says, in Answer thereto. His Words are in the Beginning of his Letter: “I must do him the Justice to own, that in Page 48, “he has inserted a Salvo for Cathedral Churches, to “Sing the Creed as before; and he is consenting, that “for the rest, it may be left to the Minister's Discretion, either to use it, or to change it for some other “Creed; which is as much as to say, that provided it “be but once set afloat, he can be content, that it “should be sent off decently, or leisurely, and according “to Art. The *Whole*, I think, *depends* upon the “Strength of his *Arguments*; for if his *Pleas* for dropping that *Creed*, or for slighting it at all, be *true* and “just, no matter how *frankly*, or how *suddenly* it were “thrown off: But if his *Reasons* be false or wrong, then “the dropping of the Creed in a *smooth, artful way*, is “only doing an *Ill Thing* with the *greater Guile*, and “adding *Treachery* to *Iniquity*.

MY *Reasons* for the total Disuse of the Creed, you will remember, were given in the Words of the great Men before mentioned, and not my own: And if their Reasoning be false or wrong, I can be no otherwise in fault, than by making use of them on the Occasion; but my Author has not proved they are so. (As to my Arguments taken from Facts, that also remains unanswered, contrary to his Promise) Now wherein is there Guile and Treachery in all this? Is so openly recommending the total Disuse of the *Athanasian Creed*, by two clear and

A DEFENCE of the ESSAY

and convincing Arguments, the *one* taken from Facts, the *other* from the Reason of the Thing, an Instance thereof? I believe none will say it is. And should it be so esteemed, the Censure will not rest on me, but on those Great Men, whose Words supplied me with that Argument. But if the *insinuated Guile* and *Treachery* appear in the singular Instance of recommending the Use of that *Creed* at the *Minister's Discretion*, (one or other of which it must be, if at all; for its Use in Cathedral Churches was no way to be *altered*, unless by a total Disuse) then, “the smooth, artful Manner in which it was intended to be dropped, doing an Ill Thing with the greater Guile, and adding *Treachery* to *Iniquity*,” are *Epithets* that will not stick on me, but on the Commissioners, in the Year 1689. who were appointed to Review the Liturgy; and whom his present Grace of *Canterbury*, as you will find in my *Essay*,* declared on a very solemn Occasion, “Were a set of Men, than which this Church was never at any time, blessed with either Wiser or Better, since it was a Church.” And yet these Most, Right Reverend, and Reverend Persons, so exalted in Station, so eminent in their Professions, so pious and exemplary in their Lives, are the Persons to whom our Author's Character, “Of doing an ill Thing with the greater Guile, and adding Treachery to Iniquity,” does solely belong, and not to my self: for they agreed to lay before the Convocation, had they afterwards met, a Proposal, for having this Creed exchanged for the Apostles, at the Minister's Discretion, as Dr. NICHOLL's informs us.

HIS Words are, † “The Reverend Persons do now forthwith apply themselves to the Business which

* Pag. 13.

† Defence of the Church of England, p. 117. Eng. Edit.

for a Review of the COMMON PRAYER. 9

“ was laid before them, and begin their Work with a
“ Review of the *Common Prayer*: And first of all, the
“ Calendar comes under Examination; from whence the
“ *Apocryphal Lessons* are expunged; and Chapters out
“ of the Canonical Books are substituted, to be read in
“ their room. The *Creed* which is called *ATHANA-*
“ *SIUS's*, because it is found Fault with by some Persons,
“ by reason of the Damnatory Sentences, is PERMIT-
“ TED TO BE CHANGED FOR THE APOSTLES
“ CREED, AT THE DISCRETION OF THE MI-
“ NISTER.

NOW what must this *Letter-Writer* think of him-
self, thus to asperse the Memory of so many great and
good Men; to fix on them this Character, that they
were Persons of *smooth Art and great Guile*, and who
could add *Treachery to Iniquity*; and for what Reason
are they, and me, thus indecently treated, why! only for
recommending the Exchange of the *Athanasian Creed* for
the Apostles, at the Discretion of the Minister: Indecent-
ly treated do I call it; no, let me do a little Justice to their
pious Memory, and give it the Term it deserves, a most
base Calumny, a most foul and scandalous Reflection,
not only on themselves, but on his present Grace of
Canterbury; who, before Lords and Commons, on a
Publick Occasion, in a very solemn manner, not only
gave these very Persons the Character, of being a *Sett*
of Men, than which this Church was never blessed with
either wiser or better; but also spoke in favour of that
Design.

IF the Author is a *Clergyman*, he ought to take
Shame to himself, for thus vilifying the Dead so un-
deservedly; and in the Face of the World, charging
his *Metropolitan*, with asserting a manifest Untruth,
and that before the highest Court of Judicature in

10 . A DEFENCE of the ESSAY

this Kingdom, the *Dernier resort* of Justice, even Lords and Commons, assembled to try a Clergyman, whom his Grace thought, had among other Crimes, offended in reflecting on those Commissioners, and that Design, which I am now also endeavouring to vindicate, from an Aspersion of the like Nature, cast on both by this *Letter-Writer*. For his Grace's Character of them must be false, if the *Letter-Writer's* Assertion is true, that to leave the *Athanasian Creed*, to be used at the Minister's Discretion, is an Instance of Guile and treacherous Iniquity.

IF he is a Clergyman of any Eminency, it still aggravates his Guilt; and so far from receiving Thanks for his Performance, may expect to be rebuked and censured by his Diocesan, for thus defaming the Dead, offering such an Indignity to his Metropolitan, and imposing on the Reader's Understanding. But I spare him here, because he is so skilful in the Art of Defamation, that I shall have occasion again presently, to observe his great Talent, in that Part of Disputation.

BUT there is another Thing, which my Author thought necessary to make Introductory to his Arguments, and to which I ought to reply, before I enter upon the Matter chiefly in Debate; his Words are, "Creeds are very tender Things to meddle with, and no good Man can sit patient, under *any injurious Aspersions cast upon the established Faith*."

TO which, I answer, that Creeds are, no doubt, very tender Things to meddle with, but, Are not the *Consciences* of Men, also to be treated with all imaginable Tenderness? And is not every Man's *Salvation* of much greater moment, and nearer concern to *himself*, than it can be to another? Does an Imposition of a Creed, doubtful, abstruse, and unintelligible, and which
the

for a Review of the COMMON PRAYER. II

the Person required to subscribe it, may not either Believe or Understand, tend to the Security, or if you will, the *guarding* of the Christian Faith? Will *Christianity* be the sooner promoted, or *Deism* extinguished, for making Men profess, what they do not or cannot believe? Or is the injoining such a Creed, and damning those who do not believe it (as far as Man can do) an Instance of Goodness, Piety, and Charity? When another Creed that contains the *Fundamentals* of the Christian Faith, can be subscribed and believed, without making the Person either insincere or a Hypocrite: to me I confess, the one appears as agreeable to Reason, Scripture and Truth; as the other seems dissonant and contrary to either.

N O T long since, a very Eminent and most *Orthodox Divine*, was pleased in an Argument he was engaged in, to carry the Obligation of Positive Duties, to a most extravagant height; and which in its Consequences, as much tended to undermine and destroy all Morality (which is in Nature and Obligation, eternal, and unchangeable) as any Deist could have done, to sap Revelation. Methinks this Writer much resembles that Author in his Reasoning: The *one* affirms, (to the best of my Remembrance) that the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper, by being a positive Duty, is the *Perfection* of *Virtue*, and the receiving it makes a Man a good Christian: The *other* supposes, that the Imposition of a Creed, more *obscure*, and *less intelligible*, than any other which does contain the *prime Truth*, and is intelligible; tends more to *guard* the Faith, and make Men *true* Believers, than a Creed, that is most clear and intelligible.

T H E inconsistency of either with Truth, will better appear, by giving an Instance in each Case. A *vicious Layman*, a *Deist*, or *Dissenter*, is offered a Place; and

to qualify himself for it, must take the Sacrament; Does that work like a Charm, and make the one or other a *good Man*, a *good Christian*, or a *good Churchman*? In the other Case, let us suppose a Clergyman is offered a Living, but must on that Occasion, subscribe to the *Athanasian Creed*; and which, though he believes all of it, except the *damnatory Clauses*, yet not believing them, and being otherwise necessitated to comply for want of a Maintenance, he Subscribes thereto: But does that *change his Belief*? or make him a *good and charitable Christian*? I believe no one will think it does. And in the *first Case*, Is not the *sacred Institution of Christ*, most vilely prostituted, by such an Abuse of it? And in the *other*, is not many honest, but necessitated Men, *made Hypocrites*? Men, who might believe the *prime Truth* of the Gospel, the *Apostles* and *Nicene Creeds*; Men of exemplary Piety and Goodness, able to do abundant Service in the Ministry, and yet without Sin, cannot subscribe to the *Athanasian Creed*; that is, a Man must be guilty of the Sin of Hypocrisy, in saying he believes that Creed, tho' he may think, with the great Mr. CHILLINGWORTH, "*That the damnatory Clauses are Schismatical, and Repugnant to God's Word*." Or, with Bishop TAYLOR, "*That in the Scriptures, little is said of those Curiosities of Explication*," which are to be found in that Creed: or if he does not subscribe, himself and Family must Starve. Whether these two Doctrines came from the same *Quarter*, I know not, yet I humbly own my Ignorance, in not being able to see the *Orthodoxy*, or *Christian Piety* of either. For I cannot understand how the *bare Reception* of the Sacrament, makes a Man *good and virtuous*, or tends more to *secure the Truths of Christianity* from *Deism*, or the *Church's Danger* from *Presbytery*; than *subscribing the Athanasian Creed*, makes

a Believer, or guards the Faith from Heresy. My Reason is, because neither hinders the Worst sort of Men from being admitted, into the visible Communion of the Established Church, (from whom Danger can alone be apprehended) and yet good and useful Men, are thereby often excluded the Communion thereof,

AS to any injurious Reflections cast by me on the Established Confessions of our Faith, I intirely deny the Fact, unless it be in proposing the absolute Exchange of the Athanasian Creed, for the Apostles or Nicene. And if that is an injurious Aspersions on our Established Confessions, it more properly affects Archbishop TILLOTSON, Bishop TAYLOR, Mr. CHILLINGWORTH, &c. in whose Words my Arguments were offered for the Exchange, than it can my self. But if any such thing is to be found in the Quotations taken from those great Men, why has the Letter-Writer so silently passed over what was produced from them? For it must be observed, that he has made no Reply to the Reasons and Arguments of Bishop TAYLOR or Mr. CHILLINGWORTH, no more than to what the great and good Archbishop TILLOTSON said, in wishing we were well rid of it. And as to the Use of this Creed less frequently, I mean at the Minister's Discretion, I need add no more to evince my being innocent of casting thereby any injurious Aspersions on our Established Confessions of Faith, having already said so much on that Account: and I believe my Author would be glad, was he as innocent of casting a black, and criminal Aspersions, on so many Prelates and eminent Divines, as I am clear of his Reflection. Indeed, I do believe it was only intended against my self; but to defame a single Person has no Beauties in it, even unattended with such multiplied Circumstances of Aggravation and Guilt, as is the Case of the Letter-Writer.

14 A DEFENCE of the ESSAY

I would advise *Him*, to meditate some time on the little Use of *insidious Epithets*, in the Course of an Argument, before he again appears in Print; lest he more hurts himself, than he does his Adversary, by that low way of Writing.

I now proceed to consider the argumentative Part of his Letter; for hitherto he has been only *abusing* me; with what View I know not, unless to prejudice People against perusing my *Essay*, and approving the Design recommended in general; or by raising their Attention more to the odious Description he had given of me, than the Truth I had utter'd; that the Weakness of his own Arguments might more easily escape Observation.

THE Dispute then, between my *Author* and me, may, I think, be reduced to two Particulars; the *one*, whether the Reasons given in the *Essay*, to *exchange* the *Athanasian* Creed for the *Apostles* or the *Nicene*, are conclusive: For if they are, my *Author* in the Beginning of his Letter admits, "It is no matter how frankly, or how suddenly it was thrown off." The *other* is, which of the two *Collec'ts* for *Trinity Sunday*, the *new* or the *old*, is the clearest, plainest, and least obscure.

AS this can only be determined by Reason and Argument, and which ought in all Cases to give Balance to the Scale, according to the Weight of either; so all *Insinuations*, *Surmises*, and *false Representations*, especially those of a Personal Nature, should be prudently abandoned: and nothing but what immediately concerns the Matter in debate, ought to be regarded.

THIS is a preliminary or certain Truth, so essentially necessary to the Discovery of any one Fact, that whoever would darken and obscure, what another most heartily wishes to have cleared up and explained, has no more to do, than to prejudice the Readers Minds, with
hideous

for a Review of the COMMON PRAYER. 19

hideous Ideas of collected Suppositions, either Personal, Intentional, or Consequential; and then, tho' he knows no more of such Author's Person, his private or publick Character, than he can of his Intention, or ought to believe of a disowned Consequence, yet it too often is successful to drop the Truth in dispute, by lessening the Force of an Argument, that without such artificial Contrivance, would always prevail over Error and Mistake. The present Age affords two Instances, to confirm the Truth of this Observation; the *one* a most excellent and late exalted Prelate; the *other* a very eminent and pious Divine; whose Joint-Writings will remain everlasting Monuments of their great Abilities, Integrity, and Humanity: no less estimable for Solidity of Argument, Perspicuity of Stile, and Strength of Reason; than remarkable for a genteel, decent, and respectful Treatment, towards Those they differed from; and which added Lustre to their Performances.

THE Reader, from what has already been seen of the *Letter-Writer's* Skill and Dexterity in Misrepresentation, will therefore excuse me for making this previous Remark; since more of that nature will too soon appear.

FROM the Words before extracted (*pag. 3.*) out of my *Essay*; which I there did at large, to prevent Repetition, and whereto I refer my Reader; the first Thing the *Letter-Writer* attacks me for, is, that I have said, the *Athanasian Creed* was an Explication of the *Mystery* of the *Trinity*; which he very roundly says, "*is all a Mistake:*" but indeed does admit, that it occasionally explains the *Doctrine* of the *Trinity*.

HIS Words on the Occasion I will presently transcribe at length, and fully answer: But as the Reader will meet with many Military Expressions, (which, had they not been often repeated, would not have been critically

tically remarked on) such as *priming*, *guarding*, and *fencing*; it will be no less kind than necessary to assure him, he need not be afraid; for my Adversary talks much, but does little Execution: He is expert enough in Words, but his Reasoning and Argument perform no Exploits. Indeed, from a Consciousness, I suppose, of their inefficacy, he will now and then play a Game at *By-strokes*, and by Insinuation and Reflection, attempt to execute, what the *Weakness* of his *Arguments* could not effect. If I can be so happy as to beat him with the Weapons of Truth and Reason, I hope every Reader will be my Second, to prevent my being hurt, with his many artificial Ones. From that Presumption, with *those* only, I will engage him: And that I may be just to my Adversary, and give my Reader an Opportunity to see the Engagement fairly performed; I will extract my Author's chief Objections to what I have affirmed, and then make my Reply.

THE Substance of what the Author says, in Answer to my Assertion, that the *Athanasian Creed* attempts an Explication of the Mystery of the Trinity, apprehended by me to be inexplicable; is as follows,
 " That it is all a Mistake: the *Creed* never attempts
 " to explain any *Mystery*, but to fence and guard it
 " against insidious Opponents, aiming to make it no
 " *Mystery*,—That it guards the main Doctrine,—That
 " the Principal Design of the Creed, is to guard against
 " all Artifices, not by explaining the *Mystery*, but by
 " unravelling, or obviating any invented Subtlety brought
 " to undermine it,—That the Creed does occasionally
 " explain the *Doctrine*, not the *Mystery* of the Trinity.
 " But yet it must be observed, that explaining is not
 " the main Business of the *Creed*; for that might be
 " done in much less compass, but guarding; and even
 " that

“ that which is *explanatory*, is *guarding* at the same
 “ time. I know but of one Paragraph in the Creed, re-
 “ lating to this Head, which looks like *pure* Explica-
 “ tion; and that is, where the Creed *seems* to illustrate
 “ the Union of God-Man, by the Union of Soul and Bo-
 “ dy: and yet *even that* is not properly illustrating the
 “ *Mystery*, (which still remains as dark as before) but it
 “ is tacitly obviating a *subtle* Objection. — In the
 “ mean while, neither the Union of God-Man, nor the
 “ Union of Soul and Body, are *explained* in the Creed;
 “ or attempted. That judicious Divines---have been
 “ wont to say, that *of the three Creeds*, the first was
 “ intended to *declare* the Faith, the second to *explain*
 “ it, and the third to *guard* it.

THUS have I fairly and fully recited my Author's
 Expressions; and however they may appear to the Reader,
 I know not; but, I think, much Obscurity, *doublings*
 and *treblings*, may be discerned therein by any careful
 Observer. For Instance;

SAYS he, “ The Creed never attempts to *explain*
 any *Mystery*; and yet admits, it does *occasionally* *ex-*
plain the *Doctrine* of the *Trinity*. That “ *explaining*
 is not the *principal Design*, or *main Business* of the
 Creed, but *guarding*: (i. e. *explaining* is a part; but
guarding the *principal* or *main Business* of the Creed;
 therefore *explaining* is no part.) That *what is explana-*
tory, (just now, it did not attempt to explain) is *guard-*
ing at the same time, (i. e. I suppose being *explanatory*
 and *guarding* also, it ceases to be explanatory at all; the
 less Commission being lost in the greater.) That “ only
 one Paragraph in the Creed, looks like *pure* *Explication*.
 “ That the Creed does seem to illustrate (the *Mystery*
 of) the Union of God-Man, by the Union of Soul and
 Body. ”--- “ and yet it is not properly illustrating *that*

18 A DEFENCE of the ESSAY

Mystery; (*i. e.* it does not properly illustrate what it yet seems to illustrate.) “And that of the three Creeds, the first was intended to declare the Faith, the second to *explain* it, and the third to *guard* it: (*i. e.* the *Nicene* Creed, more concise and less explicit than the *Athanasian*, does explain the Faith, *viz.* the *Mystery* or *Doctrine* of the *Trinity*,—which just now was inexplicable; But the *Athanasian* Creed, for being more minute and express, it not *explanatory*, but only a *Guard* to secure that Faith, which, tho’ inexplicable there, yet is explained in the *Nicene*, whose Province it seems to be, Was there ever seen so many Contradictions in so few Lines? Either the *Letter-Writer*, or the *Author* of the *Essay*, is a sad Logician; but I leave the Reader to judge whom of the two it is.

AFTER the *Letter-Writer* has thus allowed, that the *Faith* or *Mystery* of the *Trinity* is explained in the *Nicene* Creed, (for the *Trinity*, was it not a *Mystery*, could not be an Article of *Faith*) I think more need not be said on this Head, than to refer my Reader to both Creeds, to see if the *Athanasian*, is not more explanatory of the Christian *Faith*, than the *Nicene*, which he admits to *explain* it; and urges the Testimony of many learned and judicious Divines, who concur with him therein.

HAVING thus detected my Author of some *Doublings*, and *dark Reasoning*, as to his Distinction between the *Explication* of the *Faith* and *Doctrine*, or as I happened to term it, the *Mystery* of the *Trinity*; and proved from himself, that the *Athanasian* Creed is really explanatory; I now come to consider, what Stress there is in his Argument taken from its being a *Guard* to the *Christian Faith*.

I confess, this is a *new* and *subtle* Distinction, or at least, appears so to me: and if true, it is strange the
Letter-

Letter-Writer should not have produced one Authority, to shew the Time when, or the Occasion of, this Creed's being appointed a *Guard* to the *Christian Faith*. Had it been so necessary a *Guard* thereto, as he represents, Ecclesiastical History most certainly would have informed us thereof, and my Author also from thence; but his Omission carries a sort of Conviction, that it was more than could be done; indeed, Bishop TAYLOR says, it was prescribed to others by the * Bishops of Rome, not as a *Guard*, but in the same Manner as many other Things were introduced by them, without any just Reason.

BUT my Author thinking the Assertion, a sufficient Proof of what he had advanced, makes the following Conclusion; " Such being really the Case, it need not
" be thought strange, if some of the *consequential* and
" *more remote* Articles of this Creed appear more *obscure*,
" than the *prime Doctrines* themselves, for in the very
" *Nature of Things*, it must often be so.

AND does he offer this as an Argument, for the Creed's being a *Guard* to the *Christian Faith*? Surely, it is a very poor Argument; as well as a Creed *obscure* and *less intelligible*, than one more clear and intelligible, is a very improper *Guard* to the *Christian Faith*. Or is it in the *Nature of Things*, that the *consequential* and *more remote Articles* of this Creed (or any other) must appear more *obscure*, than the *prime Doctrines* themselves? (i. e. Truth) and is it also in the *Nature of Things*, that what is thus more *obscure* than *prime Doctrines*, i. e. Truth, should be rather imposed on the Consciences of Men, than a Creed, which is *less obscure*, and does contain the *prime Doctrines*, or only the Truth? To me, my Author appears to be a very *obscure* Reasoner.

D 2

What

* Vid. ESSAY, pag. 42.

What an excellent Casuist would he make, to advise a scrupulous Person sooner to take a Test, wherein *Truth* is made *obscure* by *remote Consequences*; than a Test so *clear*, as to contain only the *prime Truth*? while the one insures Safety to the most scrupulous Conscience, the other would tend no less to entangle and perplex it.

THE *Apostles Creed*, wherein the *prime Doctrines*, or Truth is contained, I recommend as a Test; my Author, on the contrary, the *Athanasian*, which he admits to be more *obscure* and *unintelligible*, than a Test that only contains the *prime Truth*. Now which of these two, seems to promise most Ease and Quiet to a scrupulous Conscience, I leave every Reader to judge, and who is the best Casuist.

HIS next Paragraph I entirely approve of, *viz.* "That if Subtilties of *Men* may endanger the Faith (*I beg leave to add any Truth*) such Subtilties ought to be guarded against in a proper Way:" The *Letter-Writer* in himself, has evinced the Truth and Necessity of the Thing, and which occasions my taking so much Pains, to guard the Reader against the many Subtilties to be met with in his Letter.

I now return more particularly to consider his Argument, as to the Creed's being a *Guard* to the Christian Faith. And as this depends solely on Scripture, or the Reason of the Thing, to them can we only seek for Satisfaction.

THE Question then is, whether this Creed be really a *Guard* to the Christian Faith, and such a necessary one, as ought to be continued; and if I can prove, that the Christian Faith, is neither guarded nor secured by it, which I hope fully to evince, then my Author will not think ill of me, for endeavouring to have a Creed drop-

dropped, that is not only no *guard* to the Christian Faith, but has occasioned many needless Disputes among Christians, which otherwise would not have been: At this very time, the Reader will observe, how many eminent Bishops, and other great Men, have been abused, by the Author's own *Letter* on the Occasion of this Creed.

AND if we search the Scriptures, I may say with Bishop TAYLOR, we find there, *little of such Curiosities of Explication* of the Trinity, as are to be met with in this Creed; nor do we read of any *guard* appointed by God himself, to secure the Christian Faith, unless the Scriptures themselves, and those Rewards and Punishments of another World, promised or threatned to such as believe or disbelieve the Truths therein contained: Had any other *Guard* been necessary for the Security of the Christian Faith, can we imagine, God would not have appointed some such *Guard*, and declared it in a Manner, that all might have been safe under his Protection; but from Scripture, nothing of this appears. This Creed then has as much Pretensions from Scripture to be a *Guard* to the Christian Faith, as the Pope has from thence infallibly to explain it; just as much, and no more.

I must follow my Author yet farther on this Subject, says he, "Tests intended to *guard* any *prime Position*, must of course be *more minute*, and therefore *less intelligible commonly to the Vulgar*, than the *prime Truth* it self." He begins with *prime Position*, and Ends with *prime Truth*; as if the Conclusion of every *Position*, was always a certain *prime Truth*: But my Author in his own *Letter*, has afforded several Instances to the contrary, as the Reader has, and yet will further find.

AND

AND because my Author's chief Argument to guard the *Athanasian Creed*, from the Danger of being lost, depends on its being a *Guard* to the Christian Faith; I beg leave to enquire what he means by a *Guard*: The Word, when used in Controversy, I apprehend signifies to defend any Truth, or self-evident Proposition, by Reason and Argument when called in Question; if so, then I think his *last prime Position is not a prime Truth*; and so far from being of any Weight to support his Argument, for the retaining that Creed, that it is in fact, a very good one for its total Disuse, as I will presently evince.

THE Design of Reason and Argument, most certainly is, to make any Truth, by an *Explication* of such Truth, rather *more clear and intelligible*, than *less*; that if possible, it might be level to the meanest Capacity: With this View, Criticks and learned Men, publish Comments and Annotations on the Scriptures, that the Truth of any difficult Text, might more easily appear, and be clearer understood. But if the *Explication* of such Truths, was to be *less intelligible*, than the Text explained by them, such *Explication* would be no *Interpretation*, and their attempted Design would be inverted and become useless; because such *Explications* would be truly, "*more minute and less intelligible*, as the Letter-Writer very justly observes, than the *prime Truth*," or Texts of Scripture.

AND was it to be as my Author supposes, that *Tests the more minute they are, the less intelligible they would be to the Vulgar*; is that any Reason to make such *less intelligible minute Truths*, a *Test* therefore on the *Consciences* of Men, especially the *Vulgar* and less discerning? Surely not. I then submit it to my Reader, whether his own Argument is not a very strong one, for the total

Disuse

Disuse of the *Athanasian Creed*. I mean, because “ *The consequential and more remote Articles of that Creed, appear more obscure, minute, and less intelligible, commonly to the Vulgar, than the prime Truth itself*. I most heartily return him Thanks, for supplying me with so strong and just an Argument, for exchanging this *obscure, minute, and unintelligible Creed*, for the *Apostles*; where my Author admits, the *prime Truth itself is declared*, and I think, after a very *clear and intelligible Manner*.

BUT the *Letter-Writer*, sensible that his last Position, would not appear a *prime Truth*, to the wary and judicious Reader, endeavours to guard his *weak Position* as well as he could, by the following Comparison; the Instance is, “ *This prime Position, King GEORGE* “ *is our rightful Sovereign, is an easier Proposition, and* “ *more intelligible than many others made use of, by way* “ *of Guard, in the Renunciation of the Pope's Supremacy,* “ *or in the Abjuration Oath: Both which, notwithstanding,* “ *are found needful to secure the prime Truth,* “ *and are not thought the worse of, for being so minute,* “ *or for taking in some Terms of Art, or of Law,* “ *scarce intelligible to every one, that is obliged to take* “ *those Tests.*

NOW whatever my Author might intend by offering this Simile, in Maintenance of his Position, I know not, but fear it will terribly rebound. For that the Words of the Oath or the Renunciation of the Pope's Supremacy, are not scarcely intelligible, is, I think, false in fact, as will evidently appear from the Words themselves; permit me to recite Part of the Renunciation, which every one is obliged to say in these Words, “ I “ do make this Declaration, and every part thereof, “ in the plain and ordinary Sense of the Words, read “ unto me, as they are commonly understood by English “ Pro-

24 A DEFENCE of the ESSAY

“*Protestants*,” Does not this look as if the *Legislature*, thought, the *Words* were very *plain*, *easy*, and *intelligible*. The *Words* in the *Oath*, are as plain and easy as the other.

For this *Letter-Writer* then to insinuate, that they are not *intelligible* (or scarcely so, which is the very same thing) and that the *Legislature* should, by an Act of Parliament, require the People of *England*, to swear and solemnly declare their Belief of a Fact, in *Words* that were scarce *intelligible*. What a Reflection is this on the whole *Legislative Power*, on the *Memory* of so many glorious and immortal Princes, Noble Lords, and Right Reverend Prelates, who first enacted that Law, and have many times since ratify’d and confirmed it.

METHINKS, however he might indulge himself in Terms abusive and injurious to the *Author* of the *Essay*, yet he should have spared *Majesty* itself, and the *supreme Power* of this Nation. But to what a pitch of Indecency, sometimes Inhumanity, will the *Orthodoxy* of some Men transport them? But as a learned Bishop, the supposed Author of an ingenious Tract (and which ought to be in every Protestant’s Hands) well observes, *Orthodoxy * atones for all Vices, and Heresy extinguishes all Virtues.*

PERHAPS the *Letter-Writer* was not aware of this, when he made the Comparison. I will not anticipate the Reader’s candid Construction on the Occasion, but do think my self, that the Comparison, however well meant it might be, yet it was no less indecent, than foreign to the Argument.

THE *Papists* indeed, will no doubt thank him, for writing a *Weekly Letter*, and then dispersing it in Town and Country, wherein is affirmed, that the *Oath* of Ab-

juratation,

* *Difficulties and Discouragements*, Octavo Edit. p. 16.

jurament, and the Renunciation of the Pope's Supremacy, are expressed in Words scarce intelligible: For if true, what greater Reflection can be thrown on the glorious Revolution, our immortal Deliverer, and each of his great Successors, than to insinuate, that to keep out Popery and the Pretender, the People are obliged to take Tests, in Words scarce intelligible? But tho' it will please them, yet every true Protestant, and hearty Friend, to the present happy Establishment, must inwardly grieve, to see a Fact of such Moment and Importance to both, placed in a Light so false and scandalous.

HAVING then fully, I hope, evinced, the little weight of Reason and Argument, in what the Letter-Writer has hitherto urged, as to the Athanasian Creed's being a Guard; and the contrary of which, will presently more fully appear. I proceed, to consider his Answer to the second Reason given by me, for exchanging the Athanasian Creed, for the Apostles or Nicene; As to the first Reason assigned by me, you will remember, he has made no Reply; and here he again begins his Invectives, and charges me with being guilty of Fallacy: the Truth of which, my Reader will presently be a Judge.

HIS Words are, " From what has been said, may appear the Fallacy of another Argument, made use of in the Essay (against retaining the Athanasian Creed) namely, that the Apostles Creed contains all the Fundamentals.—I forbear to urge, that those Divines, who admit the Apostles Creed, as a full Catalogue of Fundamentals, do mean, provided always, that it be understood in its true and ancient Sense; I take no Notice, that many learned and judicious Divines (of the Foreign Protestants especially) make no Scruple of flatly denying the Position about the Apostles Creed, were it ever so fairly and justly interpreted: waving

“ all these Considerations, yea, and *admitting the Apostles*
 “ *Creed*, as a *complete Catalogue of Fundamentals*, yet
 “ what is all that to the Point in hand? The Question
 “ is not, whether that *Creed* comprizes all Fundamen-
 “ tals? but, whether it takes in all that is ordinarily ne-
 “ cessary to *guard* those *Fundamentals* against Equivo-
 “ cation, and vile, or insidious Attacks? It is plain,
 “ that it doth not; since every *Arian* or *Socinian*, will
 “ readily subscribe that *Creed*, retaining the *Words*, re-
 “ nouncing the *Faith* wrapped up in them.

I have recited the *Letter-Writer's* Words at large, both for the Reader's and my own Ease, and there are many things in them to be considered; and here I cannot but observe, what a singular Knack my Author has at affirming and denying: Says he, *I forbear to urge*, what he really did urge; and, *I take no Notice of*, what he actually did take Notice of; charges me with *Fallacy*, for saying the *Apostles Creed* contains the *Fundamentals of the Faith*; yet, himself admits it, and says, “ *That in those Words, the Faith is wrapped up.*” And if it was a *Fallacy*, must not the great Men, whom I cited, *that say it*, be also guilty thereof? It's observable, that my Author has not accused me of any one Crime, but what Bishops, Fathers, and the greatest of Men are involved in the same Guilt, if any, with my self; nay, even Councils of some hundred Bishops, cannot escape the Censure of this *orthodox* and *charitable Man*, as will hereafter appear.

A N D yet, the *Letter-Writer* himself acquits me of *Fallacy*, in saying, the *Apostles Creed* contains the *Fundamentals of Faith*, if the *Words* are understood in the true and ancient Sense. I hope, I do understand them in the right Sense; But should I not, what then? Why, I am a fallacious Man, and (I doubt not, by his Consent)

Consent) ought to be excommunicated the Church, for Writing so much Truth, as may be found in the *Essay*, and this *Defence* of it.

AS to the *Meaning* of those Divines, who admit the Apostles Creed to contain the Fundamentals of Faith; I know no other *Meaning* they had, but what their Expressions declare: and if they had any *contrary* thereto, it would be a much greater Instance of *Fallacy*, than what my *Author* had before accused them and me of.

BUT if those Divines had another *Meaning* than they express, and the *ancient Sense* of the *Creed* was different from the *modern*, and that this *Letter-Writer* knew what was *right* and *true* of either, why did he not let us know both, and thereby kindly acquit me from an *involuntary Fallacy*, and have also *charitably rescued* myself and others from *Mistake*; or, as he may think, *Heresy*? This would have been an Instance of much Goodness, as well as *Orthodoxy*; and till he thinks proper to do it, I can return him no other Answer. However, I think, in these last Words of my *Author* he begins to explain himself, and that the Secret is discovered; viz. that tho' he admits the *Apostles Creed* to contain the *Fundamentals of Faith*; and says, that *the true Faith* is therein wrapped up; yet he cannot think that Creed sufficient, without some other *Guard*, to secure the Christian Faith; because, says he, "every Arian or Socinian will readily subscribe that Creed, retaining the Words, renouncing the Faith wrapped up in them." And if that is the true Secret, I am glad it's come out.

FOR my own part, I always took it to be the highest Instance of Charity, to judge favourably of Mens Hearts and Thoughts; and therefore if any Man would, in a serious solemn manner, profess the *Christian Faith*, in the Words of the *Apostles Creed*, in which my *Author* agrees

the Faith is wrapped up; why should that Man be judged or condemned for an Arian, or Socinian? The Charity of a good Man, will never permit him to think, another renounces in his Heart, that true Faith, which in so many Words he declares to be his Belief.

I must carry this Argument a little farther: May not the same Man subscribe to the *Athanasian Creed*, retaining the Words, renouncing the *Faith wrapped up in them*? It is certainly possible. If so, wherein is one more a *Guard* to the Christian Faith than the other? Besides, had the true *Faith* wanted any other *Guard* to secure it, than the *Nicene Creed*, how came it to pass, that the famous Council which made and established that Creed, on purpose to stem the then prevailing *Arian Heresy*; a Council composed of 318 Bishops, * assembled from all Parts of the Christian World, to consider, in the most solemn manner, what might be the best and most effectual Expedient to secure, or guard the true Faith; I say, how happen'd it that they did not institute some such *Guard*? And yet we read of no other *Guard* appointed by them, than the *Nicene Creed*, which undoubtedly they thought sufficient, without any other *Explication* or *Guard*: or else their assembling from such remote Parts of the World, was of little use to the Church, or that Christian Faith, which they met on purpose to secure, from any future *Heresy*, or the Attempts of its Adversaries. What! did not so many learned and pious Fathers of the Church, know what was necessary to guard the Christian Faith, better than this *Letter-Writer*, whoever he be? Surely, when the Christian Faith, neither before or since, more required a *Safe-Guard* to defend it, can we possibly conceive, that so many Bishops as were then assembled, would have omitted

* Dr. CAVE's *Life of ATHANASIUS*, p. 57.

ted to have appointed some other proper *Guard* to secure the *Christian Faith*, besides the *Nicene Creed*, had they imagined that *Creed* would not have been *sufficient*. To question it, reflects on their *Prudence* or *Knowledge* at least, if not to bring them under the same *Condemnation* with me, of its being omitted to gratify *Deists*, or *Antitrinitarians*.

AND if my *Orthodoxy* is questioned for recommending the Disuse of the *Athanasian Creed*, is not this venerable Council exposed to the same *Censure*, for not appointing such a *Guard* as that is supposed to be? My Reader then will observe, that this *Author* *defames* by *Steps*; he begins with *private Bishops*, and ends with *General Councils*; and all this, that the *Author* of the *Essay* may be esteemed, a *sad wicked Man*; a *Man of smooth Art*, but *greater Guile*, for *adding Treachery to Iniquity*. And for what is he thus represented to the *World*? why! for dropping a *Guard* to the *Christian Faith*, as the *Letter-Writer* pretends: A *Guard* two *General Councils* of *Bishops*, those of *Nice* and *Constantinople*, could not see any *Necessity* to appoint. I mean, such a *Creed* as the *Athanasian*.

BUT if it is *Iniquity* in me to recommend the *Nicene Creed*, as a *sufficient Guard*, or *Security* of the *Christian Faith*, how will the good *ATHANASIUS* himself, one of that Council, escape the *Censure* of being guilty of the same *Iniquity*; considered, either collectively, or as an individual Member of that venerable Assembly? I hope the *Letter-Writer* will bear to read what his good *Friend* says, and also permit his *Acquaintance* to read his *Words*, tho' not my *Essay*: what comes from *ATHANASIUS* himself, surely, can have no spice of *Arianism*. You will find his *Words* related by Bishop *BEVERIDGE*, on occasion of that Bishop's speaking in favour

favour of the *Nicene* Creed, and which therefore makes it a double Testimony, as to the Regard due to it : I will recite the whole Paragraph from the Bishop ; his Words are, * “ I shall not take it (*the Nicene Creed*) “ to pieces here, but only shew in general, what Esteem “ the Fathers of old had of this Creed. And here I “ might first shew how there were above 300 Fathers “ at one time in the Council of *Nice*, that then did “ unanimously subscribe unto it, amongst whom *ATHANASIUS* himself was one, who hath left his own “ Judgment in particular upon it, in his Writings, saying amongst other things ; *Let the things which were “ confessed by the Nicene Council prevail, for they are “ right, and sufficient to overturn all the most wicked “ Heresies, but especially the Arian, that blasphemeth “ the Word of God, and so necessarily speaketh Evil of “ the Holy Ghost.*

SO that *ATHANASIUS* admits the *Nicene* Creed, *sufficient to overturn all the most wicked Heresies, especially the Arian*, of which my Author seems most afraid : Wherein have I then so much offended, by recommending the Use of a Creed, which my Author’s dear Friend so much extols ; and that *ATHANASIUS* did so much approve thereof, is one strong Circumstantial Proof, among others, that the Creed under his Name, was never made by him ; for if the *Nicene Creed* was full enough, to overthrow the most wicked Heresy, in the Opinion of *ATHANASIUS*, the less needful, or probable, was it, that he should make another.

THE Words of Mr. BARCLAY, in his *Persuasive to the People of Scotland*, I beg leave to transcribe, as being very pertinent on the Occasion ; † says he, “ This Creed (speaking of the *Nicene*) has been “ always

* *Exposit. of the XXXIX Articles*, 3d Edit. p. 181.

† Page 114.

“ always thought the best Test against Arianism, Ma-
 “ cedonianism, &c. of old, and Socinianism of late days,
 “ of any Confession of Faith that has been used in the
 “ Church ;” without excepting the *Athanasian*. *This is*
the Creed I have recommended ; and do believe in : but
 what is *Orthodoxy* in one Man, is *Heterodoxy* in another.

BUT, says the *Letter-Writer*, “ a Creed (i. e. the
 “ Apostles) so perverted to a low and wrong Mean-
 “ ing (*viz.* when subscribed by one, who will retain the
 “ Words, but renounce the Faith wrapped up in them)
 “ does as much want other more explicate Formularies,
 “ to support its true Sense and right Use ; as Scripture,
 “ once depraved by false Glosses, wants sounder Com-
 “ ments, to restore it to its primitive Beauty and Per-
 “ fection : Therefore it is highly requisite, to have some
 “ such Creed, as the *Athanasian* at hand, in order to
 “ guard the more effectually against Seducers.

I readily admit, that the Apostles Creed, and any
 other, perverted to a wrong Meaning, as well as Scrip-
 ture depraved by false Glosses, may in either Case, want
 the Assistance of Explication and Comment, to restore
 each to a true and right Sense ; so it be more, and not less
 intelligible, by being minute ; and yet, does it follow from
 thence, that either should be enjoined as an Article of
 Faith ? Why must Man’s Explication of the Articles of
 Faith, which are but so many Texts of Scripture, be-
 come so sacred, as to be made a Test of ; when a Com-
 ment on all, or any other Parts of Scripture, is never
 insisted on as a Test ? For instance, suppose ATHANA-
 SIUS was the *Author* of the *Creed* under his Name,
 (which I do not admit) as Bishop PATRICK certainly
 was, of several Commentaries on the Bible, and each
 well performed and esteemed, yet what Reason is there
 for one, more than the other, to be subscribed to as
 Articles

Articles of Faith ! The Sentiments of both may be of use, considered as a Help to inform Mankind ; but either ceases to be useful, when imposed on such Men to believe, as think it contrary to what they ought to believe.

FROM whence, I infer, that my Author, tho' right in his Premises, is very wrong in his Conclusion ; I mean, should the *Apostles Creed* be perverted to a wrong Meaning, which I grant may be possible, yet it's no Consequence, that the *Athanasian Creed* is requisite, to guard against it ; or that any *Explication* in Defence thereof, ought to be made a *Test*, or *Article of Faith*.

I now come to consider the Facts urged by my Author, in respect of his darling Creed : There is near two hundred Years difference between him and me, as to its Antiquity and first Use in the Church. I leave it to the Reader to believe Dr. CAVE, a very eminent and learned Divine, or this *anonymous Writer*, it not being worth a Dispute. I therefore hasten to examine the Truth of other Facts, much more material.

AND now my Author, fearing (not without a just Cause of Fear) that his Arguments hitherto would not bare the Test of the Judicious and Discerning, he begins to use a little *smooth Art* (which is a harmless Accusation, in Comparison of great Guile and treacherous Iniquity) and to sooth the Passions of Men ; and thereby, if possible, to save his dear Creed, from its threatned Destiny ; and to that Purpose, implores the Aid and Assistance of all foreign Protestant Churches Abroad, and Dissenters at Home, to discountenance the Attempt ; for he represents the throwing out of this Creed, “ as contrary to the Sentiments of the *Greek Churches*, the “ *Lutheran and Calvinist* ; and as what would give great “ Offence, to every sincere Member of the Church of

“ Eng.

England and Scotland, and the Dissenters, which together (he says) makes up the Bulk and Body of the three Kingdoms.

I must confess, this looks formidable; and had not my Reader by this time, experienced the Truth and Usefulness of my former Caution, not to be terrified at my Adversary's Expressions, he might here be in pain for me; and either question my Courage, or blame my Prudence; for proceeding farther: But a little Patience will make him and me perfectly easy; whatever may be the Case of the *Letter-Writer*.

THE Truth of the Fact I shall first endeavour to disprove; or if true, demonstrate it to be no conclusive Argument, not even to my Author himself, on other Occasions.

I begin with the *Greek Church*, and it is notorious to all, that they deny the Procession of the Holy Ghost from the Son; and who therefore cannot be supposed to receive it. And that the exchanging the *Athanasian Creed*, for the Apostles or *Nicene*, would not be disagreeable to the Protestant Churches abroad; is plain from the Letter mentioned in the *Essay* * (made use of by his Grace of *Canterbury*, on the Trial of Dr. SACHEVEREL) by which it appears, "That the French, German, and other Foreign Christians, of the reformed Religion, in Holland, Geneva, Switzerland, and other Places (exclusive of those of the Lutheran Communion) esteemed the Conditions proposed in the Bill, for uniting Protestants, which had been communicated to them, as Terms full of Christian Moderation, and fit for the Uniting of Protestants. And you will remember; I have proved from Dr. NICHOLLS, † (who, as Bishop KENNET informs us, ‡ had an Abstract of the Proceedings of those Commissioners in 1689,

F

com-

* Page 17.

† Page 117. of his *Defence*.

‡ *History of England*; Vol. III. p. 591. the Notes, Letter d.

communicated to him, from Bishop WILLIAMS, one of the Commissioners) that the Use of the *Athanasian Creed*, was agreed by them, to be left indifferent, to the Discretion of the Minister.

NAY, it is remarkable, that the Book wherein Dr. NICHOLLS observes this, was intended by him, as an Appeal to the Foreign Protestant Churches, to interpose, and if possible, compose the Differences between the Protestant Churches at Home and Abroad: His Words are, * “ I APPEAL TO THE CHURCH OF
“ THE PROTESTANTS; before them let our Cause be
“ tried; that all the Holy Persons throughout the Re-
“ formed World, may endeavour to find out some Me-
“ thod, how the Differences among the Protestants of
“ our Country may be reconciled, and the Wounds of
“ our *English Church* may be healed.” And can it be imagined, he would in this very Book, have taken Notice of the *Athanasian Creed*’s being intended by the Commissioners, appointed to review our Liturgy, to be so indifferently used, by our Church, had they either retain’d it themselves, or were much averse to its Disuse. These are two Circumstantial Proofs, that the Foreign Churches are at least not very tenacious of the Creed; should it be used by them.

BUT supposing the Fact was, as represented by the *Letter-Writer*, that their Sentiments, were to the greatest Degree in favour of it; this will do him little service.

FOR it must be observed, that his Argument, for retaining this Creed, taken from Foreign Churches, whom he supposes to have a great Veneration for it, is built on the sole Authority of those Churches, and not from the Reason of the Thing; an Argument that ought to

to have no Weight in the present Case, because my Author himself, if a Protestant, will deny the Validity thereof, in other similar Instances, I shall mention; and which will prove the little Deference he himself pays to those Authorities, he would fain have others submit to. Let me ask him then, Will he think the *Greek Church*, a good and sufficient Authority for him to deny the *Procession of the Holy Ghost from the Son?* or, the *Lutheran*, to make him believe the *Consubstantiality of Christ in the Sacrament?* or, the *Calvinists, Kirk of Scotland, and Dissenters at home*, to believe with some of each the dreadful *Doctrine of Election and Reprobation*; and reject, with all of the three, *Episcopacy* and a *Form of Prayer?* I am certain he will not. Why then must I or others think their *Authorities* of weight, as to the *Athanasian Creed*, supposing it was retained by them, more than *he himself*, in the *Instances* before observed.

THE Reader will surely see the Fallacy of this Argument, and which could only be used to deceive others; since in other Cases he denies the same Authority to be conclusive, that here he would be thought to magnify beyond measure.

AND indeed was this an Argument of Truth, it must impeach the whole *Reformation* both at Home and Abroad; for there was a time, *when Prayers in an unknown Tongue, Transubstantiation, Image-Worship, the Infallibility of the Pope, and Supremacy of the Church*; nay, the whole *Trumpetry of Popery*, were established *Doctrines*, not in England only, but throughout Europe. But our wise Reformers thought this Argument of no weight; many of whom were also blessed Martyrs; and who did by their Death prove the Weakness and Fallacy thereof: and which, was it put into the Mouth of a *Papist*, would bear equally strong against abolishing Transubstantiation,

Image-Worship, &c. and all the Errors of the Church of Rome, rejected at the Reformation, as it can do against my self, for recommending the Disuse of the *Athanasian Creed*.

THE Reader then will observe the Logician and fair Reasoner, the Man of *no Guile*, whose Reasoning is not *smooth and artful*.

PERHAPS my Author will urge, that what was done at the Reformation, concerns not our Argument; for that was the rejection of Errors crept into the Church, which was but reasonable, whereas no Error can be pretended in the *Athanasian Creed*; which makes the Case vastly different. If he insists on this, I then say, he has dropped his *Argument, taken from Authority*, and admits, that the *Reason of the Thing* is alone to take Place; in which, I intirely agree with him, and am glad he is brought to Reason at last, the only sure and certain Argument; for tho' *Authorities with Reason*, will seldom fail of bringing Satisfaction, if not Conviction, to every honest Enquirer after Truth; yet *Authority without Reason*, will never effect it.

THE Reasons, then, for the Disuse of the *Athanasian Creed*, you will find in my *Essay*, * not for any erroneous Doctrines therein; but, as Bishop TAYLOR (there cited) well observes, on Account “ of those Curiosities of Explication, of which the Scripture says little.
 “ For putting Uncharitableness into the Creed, (that is,
 “ the Damnatory Clauses) and making it become as an Article of Faith, though not the Faith of ATHANASIUS.
 “ For altering the Simplicity of the Christian Faith,
 “ making it so curious and inarticulate, as to require
 “ much subtilty to understand the Words; and because
 “ many Bishops, did, with my self, and others now,
 “ dislike the Nicety and Curiosity of explaining it, think

* From page 40, to 44.

“ing it more agreeable to the Practice of the Apostles,
“to have made a Determination of the Article by way of
“Exposition of the Apostles Creed.

I apprehend then, the Argument the Letter-Writer has taken from the Authorities of Foreign Churches, and Dissenters at Home, supposing the Fact true, that the first do receive and approve of that Creed, which I think is more than doubtful, yet it has little availed him. But that the Dissenters approve thereof, I positively deny, and will prove they do not. Indeed, it is not a little surprizing, my Author should affirm, that the Disuse of the *Athanasian Creed*, would give Offence to the Dissenters; when it is notoriously known, that it ever was one Objection against their Conformity, and still remains so. And if he will look into the Treatises writ against them, he will find that Creed objected to, and always made a principal Point to be considered; he must know this, but lest my Reader may question any Fact alledged, by one whom he has so decently represented, unless supported by Authorities; for that Reason, I shall produce a few.

THUS writes Dr. BENNET *, “The established Church, has been very much blamed by the Dissenters, for making what we commonly call the *Athanasian Creed*, a Part of her Liturgy, and thereby obliging her Members to the Use of it.

WHAT! do the Dissenters blame the established Church, for making this Creed part of her Liturgy, as Dr. BENNET says, and yet can it be true what my Author affirms, that the sounder part of them, will dislike the throwing it out?

Mr.

* Paraphrase on the Common Prayer, 2d Edit. p. 262.

MR. BINGHAM, well known by his Writings, in a Treatise against the *Dissenters*, says, "That one Reason why some cannot subscribe the *Articles* and the *Liturgy* is, because they command the *Belief* and *Use* of the *Athanasian Creed*;" and quotes the Authority of Mr. BAXTER, for that Purpose.

AND that excellent Prelate, the present Bishop of Winchester, will pardon me, if in the Defence of Truth, I make use of his Lordship's Words on the Occasion. In his *Reasonableness of Conformity*, represented to the Dissenting Ministers, p. 1. his Lordship says, "I am one, who sincerely desire a greater Union among Protestants, than we are yet arrived at." P. 73. his Lordship urges one of the Ministers Objections to be, "That they cannot Assent and Consent to the *Athanasian Creed*, and therefore cannot conform as Ministers." And do not these several Authorities prove, that the *Athanasian Creed*, is one material Objection, made by Dissenters, against Conformity?

THERE is one Paragraph more, which I beg leave to transcribe from the last great Author; says his Lordship, "I confess, I agree with you, (i. e. the Dissenting Ministers) thus far, that I cannot apprehend, how the Publick Service, WOULD suffer, were there no such damnatory Sentences, ever read in it. Nay, I am of Opinion, that the Doctrine of the Trinity, would be better secured, and this very Account of it better received, without such Sentences, than with them."

THESE are Testimonies from Divines of the Church of England, in direct Opposition to the Letter-Writer's Assertion, viz. "That the Disuse of the *Athanasian Creed*, will give great Offence to the Dissenters; and be an improper Method to bring them into the Church

“ of England.” For how can the Dissenters be offended, at the Rejection, of what they have always objected to, and opposed?

Dr. CALAMY, speaking of the Commissioners in 1689, who were appointed to review the Liturgy*, thus expresses himself on that Occasion; “ They drew up sundry Alterations, a Copy of which I have by me.—This much I shall venture to say, that such Amendments as these were, with such Allowances, in Point of Orders, for Ordination by Presbyters, as is made 13 Eliz. cap. 12. would, in all probability, have brought in two Thirds of the Dissenters in England; which being done, and at the same time, a Liberty continued, to such as could not be comprehended, would have been greater Service, than can well be imagined.

HERE, the Reader will observe, that Dr. CALAMY speaks, as it were the Sentiments of the greatest Part of the Dissenters, and assures us, that the Alterations then intended, which he had a Copy of, would in all probability, have brought in two Thirds of the Dissenters in England: and you will remember, that Dr. NICHOLLS says, one of those Alterations was, to leave the *Athanasian Creed* indifferently to be used, as the Minister pleased.

Mr. CHANDLER, who I am informed, is held in great Esteem, with those of the Dissenting Persuasion, in his Letters to the present good Lord Bishop of London, and the Reverend Dr. BERRIMAN, writ in some measure, on Occasion of ATHANASIUS, does throughout express a great Dissatisfaction with any Subscription “ to the Scholastick, Metaphysical Doctrine of the Trinity.” And in the last Page of his Letter to my Lord,

* Bishop KENNET's History, Vol. III. p. 591.

Lord, seems importunate with his Lordship, to use his Interest, "That the Dissenters may be no longer excluded, either the Church of England, or the common Privileges of Subjects." Of which, I think it is plain from his Letters, that Subscribing to the *Athanasian Creed*, he reckons to be one Bar to their Conformity.

THE Established Church of Scotland, I am well informed, rejects this Creed; tho' the *Letter-Writer* asserts the contrary. I do not find it so much as mentioned by them in their Confessions of Faith; and as their Church is pretty much formed on the Model of our *English Dissenters*, there is not the least Reason to think they do.

AND now wherein is the *Author of the ESSAY* mistaken in his Notions of these Matters, by believing a Review of the *Common Prayer*, would tend to recommend our Liturgy to more general Esteem Abroad, and be a likely way to confirm and strengthen the Protestant Interest; even was the *Athanasian Creed* rejected; since it appears, the Dissenters at home utterly dislike it; and Foreign Protestant Churches Abroad, approved of the Commissioners Intentions in 1689. to leave it indifferent, as we find by the Letter before mentioned. And if the most eminent Bishops and Divines of the Church of England, the Established Church of Scotland, our Dissenters at Home, the Greek, and Foreign Churches Abroad, either dislike; do not receive; or think very indifferently of this Creed; can it be true, what my *Author* says, that it is universally admired?

CERTAINLY, if the *Letter-Writer* had duly considered these Matters, and but a little valued his own Reputation, and the ill Consequence of imposing on Mankind, he would never have thus misrepresented Things and Facts; and affirmed what every Body almost could disprove.

THUS

THUS have I considered at large, every material Argument and Fact urged by the Letter-Writer, for retaining the Athanasian Creed; and must leave it to the Reader's Judgment, whether I have not clearly refuted the one, and disproved the other. But there is one Paragraph in this Letter, not yet taken notice of, which upon no account should be omitted, since it exposes the Letter-Writer himself to the Danger of incurring every Epithet, he has like an orthodox Man, Divine or Gentleman, so liberally and christianly bestowed on the stigmatized Author of the Essay; a Paragraph that ought to be printed in Letters of Gold: It is this;

"BY his inserting in his new Litany these Words,
"O holy, blessed and glorious Trinity, Three Persons
"and One God, &c. he has REALLY and FULLY (if
"he is an honest Man) PROFESSED AS MUCH AS
"THE ATHANASIAN CREED DOES.

WHAT my Honesty had to do with the Argument, I know not; but if I am ever so great a Knave, I apprehend the Truth of his own Assertion will not be thereby impeached, or cease to be true. This Paragraph affords me so much inward Pleasure and Satisfaction, that tho' my Honesty is questioned on the Occasion, yet for a particular Reason, I value my Essay beyond measure, should it do no other service, than only to obtain this frank, open, and undisguised Confession; more, I do believe, from the powerful Impulse of Truth, at that time left unguarded of Subtilty and Device, than out of any regard to — the Author of the Essay.

THE Letter-Writer affirms, that to pray in this Petition, O holy, blessed and glorious Trinity, Three Persons and One God, &c. is really and fully to profess as much as the Athanasian Creed does; why then am I to be branded with those many odious Appellations,

as are to be seen in the *Letter*, only for recommending the Disuse of the *Athanasian Creed*, and substituting in its place the Apostles or *Nicene*, in order to promote Peace and Charity among Christians; when the *Letter-Writer* himself admits that the Petition in the *Litany*, a much shorter Explication, is equivalent, equal to, or in his own Words, *really and fully professing as much as the Athanasian Creed does*. And if so, what harm can there be in the Disuse of that Creed? or rather, would it not do great Service to the Church, in securing the Peace of it, and putting an End to much controversy and uncharitable Disputes, to which it has given birth. I hope then whoever does, or hereafter may know the *Letter-Writer* and the *Author* of the *Essay*, will not think the one more a *Deist*, *Antitrinitarian*, *Papist*, or *Subverter of the Faith*, for what is writ, than the other. And for my own part, I cannot possibly conceive what my Author could intend by writing such a *Letter*, unless to join with me, in having the *Athanasian Creed* at once thrown out; towards which, I hope, my Reader will think he has not a little contributed; I mean, in regard to the Weakness of his *Arguments* for its being retained.

TO sum up what has been said; *If in the Apostles Creed, is contained whatsoever is declared in the Scriptures, concerning the Blessed Trinity, and the Mystery of our Saviour's Incarnation, Death, and Crucifixion: "That it is the Perfection of Believers, by which the Bond of Infidelity is dissolved, as says St. AUSTIN: or with CASSIAN, "That it is what comprehends in few Words the Faith of both Testaments, and the Sense of the whole Scripture: Or with MAXIMUS TAURINENSIS, "That it is the Symbol by which the Faithful are separated from the Unbelieving, and whose Truth makes every Believer of it a Christian: Or with IRENÆUS, TERTULLIAN, &c.*

that it is the *Rule of Faith and Truth*. If the *Nicene Creed* was judged by 318 *Bishops*, a *Test full and pertinent*, to secure the *Christian Faith*, at a time it was most furiously attacked by the *Arian Heresy*; and as *ATHANASIUS* himself says, was sufficient to overturn the most wicked *Hereses*, especially the *Arian*. If the *Petition in the Litany*, really and fully professes as much as the *Athanasian Creed* does, which the *Letter-Writer* affirms. If the *Athanasian Creed* is no more a guard to the *Christian Faith*, than the *Nicene* or *Apostles* are; but is actually one occasion of the *Dissenters Separation* from the *Church of England*, and of many *Disputes* in the *Christian Church*. If the *Argument* taken by the *Letter-Writer*, from the *Authority of Foreign Churches*, and our *Dissenters* at home, for its being retained, is not true in *Fact*, or inconclusive otherwise. If it is more *Christian, just, and reasonable*, to establish such *Tests* for the *Security of the Christian Faith*, as are least obscure, and most intelligible, to *Vulgar Understandings*; all and every of which, has been fully demonstrated, and made very apparent. Will not the *Reader* then think (and I hope my *Author* also) that my *Pleas for dropping the Athanasian Creed*, are true and just, and not false or wrong: and that it is no *Matter*, how frankly, and how suddenly, it was thrown off. For, as to leaving it *Discretionary* to the *Ministers*, I have had Reason in the *Course of this Debate*, to change my *Mind*; not from any *Conviction of Guile or Treachery* therein, but because it might tend to fix an *Odium* on those *Ministers*, who would *Disuse* it.

HAVING finished, what to me appears necessary, concerning the *Use of the Athanasian Creed* (for my *Reader*, was he to peruse my *Essay*, will find, that is the only *Dispute*; not having my self given any *Expli-*

cation of the *Trinity*, or advanced any new Doctrine concerning it; tho' by the Author's Letter, any one might be induced to think I had) I come next to take the *Letter-Writer's* Observations on my Collect for *Trinity* Sunday into Consideration.

IN the first place, I must acknowledge my Obligations to him, for printing the two Collects in parallel Lines; being as desirous as himself, to leave it to the Reader's Judgment, which is the *most dark and obscure*, the *Old* or *New*. These Words in the *Old* one; "*And in the Power of the Divine Majesty, to worship the Unity,*" is an Expression, I solemnly declare, not to understand.

BUT it is observable, that the Obscurity of the new Collect, is the least Fault, there being many others of a more criminal Nature. Says my Author, it carries *Guilt and Diffidence in its Face*. The Guilt of what?

IS it *Arianism*, *Socinianism*, *Subordination*, or *Creature Worship*? No: he himself, in the very Place, acquits me of *either*; his Words are, "As the *Author* of "the *Essay*, professes his Belief in a *Co-equal* and *Co-eternal Trinity*, by his receiving the *Nicene Creed*, and "the *first four Petitions of the Litany*, I cannot account for his presenting us with such a Collect." Why not! wherein is my Collect so unaccountable? Is there not a *Trinity* in *Unity*, as much acknowledged and worshipped in the *New*, as in the *Old* Collect? What then is the Guilt? Are not the Expressions therein easy and plain? Where then is the Obscurity? Why! truly, my Author leaves the Reader to find out one or both, for he proves neither. It was enough for him to suggest the Guilt and Obscurity, that the Reader's Prejudice might be excited; no matter whether any just reason for it or not.

AND

AND the Sequel will, I believe, fully evince, that the *Letter-Writer*, by his *Remarks* on this *Collect*, could have no other *Intention*, than to *impose* on the *Credulity* and *Weakness*, of the unwary and injudicious Reader.

THE next *Objections* to this *Collect*, is, that I have *founded* the *Worship* of the *Son* and *Holy Spirit* on mere *Command*. I must confess, I did not know, that by the *Light of Nature*, the *Worship* to either was *discoverable*. I always thought, that it was the *New Testament* that *only revealed* it to us; that what concerned the *Person*, *Offices*, and *Character* of our *blessed Saviour*, our *Duty* in *believing*, *worshipping*, and *obeying Him*, was *Matter of meer Revelation*; the *Purport* and *Tenor* of the *Gospel*; and what made the *only*, or *most essential Distinction* between a *Christian* and a *Deist*; wherein then is it *criminal* in me, to *fix* the *Worship* due to the *Son* and *Holy Spirit*, on the *Command* of *Scripture*, when without such *Command*, there would be no *Foundation* to *worship* either? Can it be amiss, to *express* a *Duty*, known *only* from *Scripture*, by the *Word* of *Command*? In every *Dispute* with *Hereticks*, is not the *Argument* taken from *Scripture*, for the *Worship* of the *Son* and *Holy Spirit's* being therein *commanded*, the *most strong* and *convincing*?

BUT if this was a *Fault* in me, the *Letter-Writer*, as it happens, is *guilty* of the very *same Crime*: His *Words* are, “ *Such Persons* (speaking of *Arians* and “ *Socinians*) *must eternally fluctuate* between the *SCRIPTURE COMMANDS* TO *WORSHIP CHRIST*, and “ *the Scripture Disallowance* of *Creature-Worship*; and “ *must inevitably split*, either upon *Disobedience* on the “ *one Hand*, to *PLAIN PRECEPTS*, or on the like *Dis- obedience* on the other *Hand*, to as *plain Prohibitions*.” Behold the *Man*! does he not here acknowledge, that the

the *Worship* to be paid *Christ*, arises from plain *Precepts of Scripture*, and *Scripture Commands*: And are the same *Words Heterodox* in my *Essay*, that are *Orthodox* in his *Letter*? Let the Reader then judge, whether my *Collect* is most *disguised, dark, and doubling*; or this *Letter-Writer's Comment, and Observation thereon*; and which of the two are most *guilty of Writing in a smooth, artful Way*, whereby to sanctify any *hidden Guile, or treacherous Iniquity*.

ANOTHER Objection to this *innocent Collect*, is, that “some Danger is insinuated, lest the Divine Majesty should be offended, by such *Worship*, if any Mistake should happen, either in the Understanding God’s Will, or in the Manner of obeying it.

NOW I would desire to know of my Author, if it is more a Crime to pray to God, to understand his Will and our Duty, in respect to the worshipping a Trinity in Unity, which is declared to be a Mystery; than to know and understand any other Commands in the Scripture, of a more easy Nature? Is it a Duty to pray to understand the whole Will of God, as revealed in Scripture, and yet a Crime to pray to understand a Part thereof; which worshipping the Son and Holy Spirit is? and this is done by the Church of *England*. I will select a few Instances out of many *Collects*, and place them opposite to my own.

Second Sunday in Advent.

Blessed Lord, who hast
caused all holy Scrip-
tures to be written for our
Learning, grant that we
may hear them, read, mark,
learn, and inwardly digest
them,

The New Collect.

O Almighty God, who by
thy holy Gospel, hast com-
manded us to worship thy
Son,

the
the
A
out
thy
out
ne
O
las
fe
Ch
Tr
O
be
of
and
to
un
in
Scr
mit
in
der
is,
Lij
our
i. 9

them, &c. i. e. understand them.

Almighty God,——grant us so perfectly and without all Doubt, to believe in thy Son Jesus Christ, that our Faith in thy Sight may never be reprov'd, &c. *

O Almighty God, whom truly to know is everlasting Life; grant us perfectly to know thy Son Jesus Christ, to be the Way, the Truth, and the Life †.

O Most gracious God, grant to thy Servant to be filled with the Knowledge of thy Will in all Wisdom and spiritual Understanding; to walk worthy of the Lord unto all pleasing—encreasing in the Knowledge of God †.

THE First Collect prays to understand the whole Scriptures; mine is to understand part thereof, in conformity to the Day. The Second is, to have a right Faith, in believing Jesus Christ; mine is, to have a right Understanding, in worshipping Jesus Christ. The Third is, to know Jesus Christ to be the Way, the Truth, and the Life; mine is, so clearly to understand God's Will, and our Duty in worshipping Jesus Christ, as not to offend God: just

* Collect for St. THOMAS's Day. † St. PHILIP and St. JAMES.

† Bishop TAYLOR, *Unum Necessar.* p. 86. 4th Edit. Colof. i. 9, 10. 1 Thes. iii. 10, 11, 12.

Son, and Holy Spirit together with Thee; give us Grace, we beseech thee, so clearly to understand thy Will and our Duty in that Command, as not to offend thy Divine Majesty, &c.

just as in the *Collect* for St. THOMAS'S Day, so to believe in Jesus Christ, as our Faith may not be reprov'd by God, or God thereby offended: Now what is there in this new *Collect* more dark and doubling, than in either of the three old *Collects*? or contrary to the Words of Bishop TAYLOR, taken from Scripture?

THERE being so little weight in the Objections, made by my Author to this *Collect*, I begin to think, whether the true Reason of his dislike, may not be the same, as what he urged against the Apostles Creed, viz. *because every Arian or Socinian will readily say this Collect, with that Creed, retaining the Words, renouncing the Faith wrapped up in them.* If that should be the Fact, the same Answer will serve here, as I gave on the former Occasion; nor can it be any more *Reflection* on this *Collect*, than on the *Apostles Creed*; nay, so far from being therefore censured or condemned, it ought rather to have been the better liked, as being more agreeable to the *Sentiments* of his Grace of Canterbury, who observed, * “ that it never went well with the Church
“ of Christ, since Men have been so narrow spirited,
“ as to mix the Controversies of Faith, with their Publick
“ Forms of Worship; and having made their Liturgies
“ instead of being Offices of Devotion to God, become
“ Tests and Censures of the Opinions of their Brethren.

AT the Time of the Reformation, nothing was more usual, than for those who had very great Differences in religious Matters, to join in the same Worship. In Confirmation of the Truth of this Observation, I beg leave to transcribe the Words of the present Bishop of Winchester, † in his Answer to the Bishop of Oxford: His Lordship's Words are;

* ESSAY, p. 44.

† Answer to Dr. HARE'S Sermon, p. 245.

“ IF the Bishop can think it an *intolerable Thing* to
 “ worship one God, through one Mediator, *Jesus Christ*,
 “ in Company with any such as differ from him, in
 “ their Notions about the Metaphysical Nature of *Christ*,
 “ or of the *Holy Ghost*; or the like: I am sorry for it.
 “ I remember the like Objection made, at the beginning
 “ of the *Reformation*, by the *Lutherans*, against the
 “ Lawfulness of Communicating with ZUINGLIUS and
 “ his Followers; because they had not the same Notion
 “ with them, of the Elements in the Sacrament. And
 “ there was the same Objection once amongst many,
 “ against holding Communion with any such, as had
 “ not the same Notions with themselves, about the se-
 “ cret Decrees of God, relating to the *Predestination*
 “ and *Reprobation* of particular Persons. But whatever
 “ those Men may please themselves with thinking, who
 “ are sure they are arrived at the perfect Knowledge of
 “ the most abstruse Points; this they may be certain of,
 “ that, in the present State of the Church, even suppos-
 “ ing only such as are accounted *Orthodox*, to be joined
 “ together in one visible Communion, they *Communicate*
 “ together, with a very *great Variety* and *Confusion* of
 “ *Notions*; either comprehending nothing plain and dis-
 “ tinct, or differing from one another as truly, and as
 “ essentially, as others differ from them all: nay, with
 “ more certain Difference with relation to the Object of
 “ Worship, than if all Prayers were directed, (as Bishop
 “ BULL says almost all were in the first Ages) to God;
 “ or the Father, thro’ the Son. I wish this were enough
 “ considered by *Those*, who speak so much of the great
 “ Evil of having a different Object of Worship.

I now come to consider the last, and only Paragraph
 in this *Letter*, that to my Knowledge remains un-
 answered; and yet in part it has been done already.

His Words are ; “ I cannot conceive whom the *Author* “ of the *ESSAY* could reasonably hope to gratify by it, “ (*i. e.* by recommending the Disuse of the *Athanasian* “ *Creed*) except the *Deists*, who *dislike all Revelation*, “ or the *Antitrinitarians*, who *reject the ancient Faith*; “ or the *Papists*, whose Interest it is to widen our “ Breaches, and to destroy our Peace ?

W H A T induced my Author to make this Inference, I am the most astonished at, of any thing in his whole Letter, nor will I exasperate my Reader with any severe Reflections of my own on the Occasion, leaving him to do that as he may think just. Only this I can affirm, that the Author knows not my Person, tho’ he may my Name ; and was he to enquire into my private Character in Life, as to each of these Charges, he would find, that I could give sufficient Testimonies of my Sentiments, having been in each Particular, in *direct contradiction* to each *Accusation*.

W H E T H E R it can be collected from the *Essay*, I must leave the World to judge ; and such as have or may be inclined, if permitted, to read it, will soon see, what Occasion I gave, for such an angry Letter : I hint this, because, some Endeavours, I find, have been used, not only to prevent its being read, but also to represent the Author for an *Arian*. Was any Man to caution me against reading a Book, I should take it as an Affront on my own Understanding, or certainly believe there was *something* in it, that the *Person* was *unwilling to have known*, and therefore took that *Method* to *stifle* it ; and every one must think for himself, whether either is a good Reason, for not reading any condemned or forbidden Book.

A S to my being an Antitrinitarian, that is already sufficiently confuted ; and my Author, in some Parts of

his

for a Review of the COMMON PRAYER. 51

his Letter, does himself acquit me thereof. But for him to represent me as a *Deist*, or *Papist*, when the Design recommended is declared, and very seriously believed, by the Author of the *Essay*, to be a Method the most effectual to root out *Popery*, and extinguish Infidelity, is not a little extraordinary. Permit me to repeat what I said on the Occasion in pag. 16. "The happy Advantages to be obtained by a Translation of the *Bible*, "a Review of the *Common Prayer* and *Canons*, after the "Model recommended by his Grace of *Canterbury*, are "many and weighty. For it will tend to disarm the "*Papists* and *Deists*, of their Arguments taken from the "present ill Version of Scripture, some Expressions in "the Liturgy and *Church-Catechism*, and the inconsistency of Clergymens Practices with their Oath of Canonical Obedience." I would ask my Author then, is writing against *Deism* and *Popery*, an Instance of the Person's Inclination to gratify the one or other? At this rate, who may not be charged with the Guilt of Hypocrisy? and be said to be of that Party he writes against, only because with an earnest Zeal he does write against them? For that is all the Reason given by my Author for representing me to be a *Papist*. Will he remember the Notion of the *Real Presence* is confuted in the *Essay*; and would Priest or Jesuit attempt such a Thing?

IS it not notorious that the *Papists* are utterly averse to all *Reformation*, and would they write then an *Essay* in favour of what they more dread than any one thing? If my Author will not believe this Truth from me, yet he will certainly regard what the late good Archbishop TENISON observed of them, who was one of the Commissioners in 1689. appointed to review the Liturgy, cited by Bishop KENNET; and which makes it the Testimony of two Bishops to the Truth of the same

Fact : * “ Dr. THOMAS TENISON, afterwards Arch-
 “ bishop of Canterbury, did observe in his Discourse
 “ concerning the Ecclesiastical Commission, in 1689. that
 “ the Spirit of Popery was already moving at Court, and
 “ obstructing Reformation and Union ; his Words are,
 “ Our Constitution was reviewed in 61. and yet, not-
 “ withstanding that Review, is capable of another : the
 “ Commissioners of that Time did not add the last Hand
 “ to that Work, so as to render it incapable ever after
 “ of being Corrected and Improved : Some, who have
 “ well considered all the Alterations and Additions then
 “ made by them, (which amount to the Number of about
 “ 600.) are sufficiently convinced, that if they had Rea-
 “ son for those Changes, there is equal, if not greater
 “ Reason, for some farther Improvements. If they had
 “ foreseen what is since come to pass, I charitably be-
 “ lieve they would not have done all that they did, and
 “ just so much, and no more. And yet I also believe,
 “ that if they had offered to move much farther, a Stone
 “ would have been laid under their Wheel, by a secret
 “ but powerful Hand : The Mystery of Popery did even
 “ then work ; and a Romanist has very frankly inform-
 “ ed us, of the Expectation raised in that Party, in the
 “ Beginning of the Summer 61.

FROM these Words of his late Grace of Canterbury,
 it fully appears that in 61. when the *Liturgy* was review-
 ed, and in 89. when intended to be reviewed, that the
Spirit of Popery discovered itself in *obstructing Reforma-*
tion and Union : And can any believe that in 1734. a
Scheme of Reformation should come from that Quarter ?
 What a piece of Deception then, is this in my Author ?

THE Reader will also observe, that it was his Grace's
 Sentiments, “ That notwithstanding the *Review* in 61.

it

* *History of England*, Vol. III. p. 252. Note a.

it is still capable of another ; and that the last Hand was not then put to that Work : “ That tho’ there were above 600 Alterations then made ; yet if there were *Reasons* for those Changes, there is equal, if not greater Reason, still for some farther Improvements.

AND much to the same Purpose writes Bishop BURNET : Says his Lordship, * “ Our Worship is the “ perfectest Composition of Devotion, that we find in “ any Church ancient or modern ; yet the *Corrections* “ that were agreed to, by a Deputation of Bishops and “ Divines, in the Year 1689. would make the whole “ Frame of our Liturgy, still more perfect, as well as “ more unexceptionable ; and will, I hope, at some time “ or other, be better entertained, than they were then.” The Reader will have in Remembrance, that the indifferent Use of the *Athanasian Creed*, was one of those Corrections, the Bishop thinks would tend to make our Liturgy, more perfect and more unexceptionable.

THESE great Authorities, added to those I have made use of in the *Essay*, ought to have weight, in favour of a Review of the Common Prayer, if only in respect to the greater Purity and Improvement of our Liturgy, for the Benefit of those of the Established Communion, exclusive of any Views towards a *Comprehension*, or the least regard to our Dissenters.

I am therefore still fully persuaded, that as the late excellent Writings of our Bishops and Clergy, have done an infinite Service to revealed Religion, in defending it from the Attacks of *Deists* and *Infidels* ; so would a Review of our Liturgy, with a new Translation of the Bible, in Conjunction therewith, have a great tendency, to remove the Objections of *Deists*, to refute the Errors of the *Romish* Church, and lessen the Number of both.

For

* History of his own Times, Vol. II. p. 634.

For the *more* the Truths of Scripture appear in their native Beauty; the *more* the Doctrine of Protestants, are represented in a clear and perspicuous Light; the *greater Reason* will there be to hope and expect, that *Infidelity* and *Popery*, will *gradually decrease* among us, and in time, be *totally extinguished*.

AND as the Design recommended, will conduce to diminish Deism and Popery, and in its Consequences tend to impress the Duties of Natural and Revealed Religion, more powerfully on the Minds of all; so will a *nearer Union among Protestants*, tho' it should not be in *one Way of Worship*, no less conspire to cement and strengthen the *Protestant Interest*, both at Home and Abroad, and under God, be the only means of securing to us, our Religion, Laws, and Liberties. *Blessings* we may always hope to enjoy, so long as *one* of this *Protestant Royal Family*, sways the *British Sceptre*; which I pray, may be till Time shall be no more.

WITH a View of obtaining those great Ends, I published my *Essay*, that by a more correct Translation of the Bible, the Scriptures might be better understood; and by a Review of the Common Prayer, our Liturgy might be render'd more plain, exact, and perfect, and less liable to any Objection: That so our Church, which is the Bulwark of the Protestant Churches, might shine with yet greater Lustre, and become the Praise of the whole Earth.

AND as I apprehend nothing will more conduce to promote a Reformation, than the clear Understanding of the Scriptures, so every impartial Enquirer into the Knowledge of them, let him be of the *Clergy* or *Laity*, ought to meet with all suitable Encouragement in his Studies: This is a true Protestant Principle, the only certain Principle to be depended on, for the Discovery of Scripture Truths. There are some

Expressions so beautiful, and pertinent to this Purpose, in the Conclusion of that honest and ingenious Tract before-mentioned, *viz.* *The Difficulties and Discouragements* which attend the Study of the Scriptures in a private Way, that I beg leave to transcribe from thence a few Lines: “ There is nothing more absurd, than to “ say the glorious Things we do daily of the Scriptures; “ and, at the same time, make the Study of them, to “ Men of sincere and honest Minds, so extremely hazardous and inconvenient. If then we—would be “ true to the Fundamental Principles of the Reformation, as Protestants, that the Scriptures are the only “ Rule of Faith; let us use our best Endeavours to “ remove the great Obstacles, that lie against the Study “ of them; let us do what we can, that learned Men “ may have full Liberty to study the Scriptures freely and “ impartially,—have leave to speak their Sense with all “ manner of Safety; that their Opinions may be examined fairly, and with Temper; that their Names be “ not unjustly loaded with Calumny and Slander;— “ That if what they advance be right, it may be received; if wrong, their Errors may be refuted, as the “ Mistakes of learned Men on other Subjects.—That “ as long as they live virtuously, and write with all due “ Modesty and good Manners, and advance nothing “ that breaks in upon Morality and Government, they “ may be treated in all respects, as those are or ought to be, who imploy themselves in any other part of “ useful Learning. I fear, I must add, that till so difficult a Study meets with proportionable Encouragement; ’tis impossible a sincere, impartial, and laborious “ Application to it, should generally prevail; and till it “ does, it is as impossible that the Scriptures should be “ well understood; and till they are, they are a Rule “ of

“ of Faith in Name only : for it is not the Words of
 “ Scripture, but the *Sense*, which is the *Rule*; and so
 “ far as that is not *understood*, so far the *Scriptures* are
 “ not our *Rule*, whatever we pretend; but the *Sense*
 “ that *Men* have put on them; *Men*, fallible as ourselves;
 “ and who were by no Means so well furnished; as the
 “ *Learned at present are*, with the proper *Helps* to find
 “ out the true *Meaning of Scripture*: And while we
 “ take the *Sense* of the *Scriptures* in this Manner; upon
 “ Content, and see not with our own *Eyes*, we insensibly
 “ Relapse into the *Principles of Popery*, and give up the
 “ only *Ground*, on which we can justify our *Separation*
 “ from the *Church of Rome*. ’Twas a Right to study
 “ and judge of the *Scriptures* for themselves, that our
 “ first Reformers asserted with so good Effect; and their
 “ Successors can defend their Adherence to them, on no
 “ other Principle.

“ IF then we are concerned for the Study of the
 “ *Scriptures*, further than in Words; if we in earnest
 “ think them the only *Rule of Faith*; let us act as if
 “ we thought so: let us heartily encourage a free and
 “ impartial Study of them; let us lay aside that malig-
 “ nant, arbitrary, persecuting, Popish Spirit, let us put
 “ no Fetters on Mens Understandings, nor any other
 “ Bounds to their Enquiries, but what God and Truth
 “ have set. Let us, if we would not give up the *Pro-*
 “ testant Principle, that the *Scriptures are plain and*
 “ *clear*, in the necessary *Articles*; declare nothing to be
 “ necessary, but what is clearly revealed in them.

TO conclude all, I can with great Truth assure the
 Letter-Writer, if he will believe me, (and I am apt to
 think the Reader will agree, he has no Reason to do
 otherwise) that I am really and sincerely, a Friend to;
 and in the Interest of the Christian Faith, and have as
 just.

just Concern, and true Value for the prime Articles of the Trinity and Incarnation, as he himself can have; and yet I may, and do dislike the retaining the Athanasian Creed in publick Worship. Nor does any Reason appear, why I should be questioned therein, for saying, the Nicene and Apostles Creeds contain the Fundamentals of Faith; more than my Author, for affirming himself, that whoever joins in the first four Petitions of the Litany, does really and fully profess a Belief in a coequal and coeternal Trinity, and as much as the Athanasian Creed does: But should those Petitions express so much as the Athanasian Creed, yet I hope the Apostles or Nicene Creed, or both, will notwithstanding ever remain in the Christian Church. So little an Enemy am I to the Christian Faith.

LONDON,
Novem. 4. 1734.

POSTSCRIPT.

THERE being something both of a Publick and Private Nature, in the Circumstances and Management of this Dispute, that much resembles the Case of Bishop TAYLOR, when he published his Thoughts to the World on *Original Sin*; only changing the Subject: (his being for writing against St. AUSTIN's severe Doctrine of God's *damning Infants* for *Original Sin*, and mine against the uncharitable Doctrine of the *Athanasian Creed*; which pronounces Damnation on all who do not believe the Christian Faith, in the Words therein explained or expressed) that I knew not how to avoid the Reprinting here his Lordship's Dedication to the

then Countess of *Devonshire*, prefixed to his *Deus Justificatus*; it being so singularly well adapted to the Circumstances of the present Case. For as that eminently pious Countess had been offended at what the Bishop had asserted in that Argument, and which obliged him to compose a Tract in Vindication of himself; so is it no less my Misfortune, to have given Offence to a Lady of distinguished Merit, Piety, and Religion; who, I have some Reason to think, may have been spirited up to a Resentment against me, on Occasion of my Essay; much in the same manner, as was complained of by the Bishop; and that Instance has afforded me a good Reason to publish this in my own Defence. And as the Countess did not take amiss his Lordship's Dedication, so I hope the good Lady, whom I no less venerate and esteem, will not blame me, for making Use of that great Prelate's Dedication to his Countess, here, it being so applicable to my own Case; since the Treatment I have met with from the Letter-Writer, as well as the Misunderstanding, that unhappily subsists between her self and me, are so very Similar and Parallel. And the Words of so great a Man, to so honourable and accomplished a Lady, will certainly give less Offence than any of my own; and which I hope will be a Means of the Lady's having a better Opinion of the Essay, and the Design therein recommended; as well as restore me to that good Esteem she had often expressed for me, till some had prevailed on her to think, (that, as the Bishop terras it) in my Essay a Snake lay under the Plantain. But as Justice is Part of Goodness, and this Lady so tender, not willingly to transgress against either: I am persuaded, after her candid Perusal of my Defence, I shall as much experience the one, as I have done the other; and which will be esteemed a great Happiness. The Bishop's Vindication to that Countess, was in these Words.



TO THE

Right Honourable and Religious Lady,

THE LADY

CHRISTIAN,

Countess Dowager of DEVONSHIRE.

MADAM,



“ *W*HEN I reflect upon the infinite Dis-
“ putes, which have troubled the Publick
“ Meetings of Christendom, concerning
“ Original Sin; and how impatient and
“ vext some Men lately have been, when I
“ offered to them my Endeavours and Conjectures concerning
“ that Question, with Purposes very differing from what
“ were seen in the Face of other Mens Designs, and had
“ handled it so, that God might be glorified in the Article, and
“ Men might be instructed and edified, in order to a good
“ Life; I could not but think, that wise Heathen said
“ rarely well in his little Adage, relating to the present
“ Subject, Εἰς ἄγνοίαν ἕρπυσεν. Mankind was born
“ to be a Riddle, and our Nativity is in the dark. For
“ Men have taken the Liberty to think what they please,
“ and to say what they think; and they affirm many
“ Things, and can prove but few Things; and take the
“ Sayings of Men for the Oracles of GOD, and hold
“ Affirmatives for convincing Arguments; and St. PAUL's

“ Text must be understood by St. AUSTIN’s Commentary,
 “ and St. AUSTIN shall be heard in all, because he spake
 “ against such Men, who in some Things were not to be
 “ heard: and after all, because his Doctrine was taken
 “ for granted by ignorant Ages, and being received so
 “ long, was incorporated into the resolved Doctrine of the
 “ Church, with so great a firmness; it became almost a
 “ Shame, to examine what the World believed so unsus-
 “ pectingly; and he that shall first attempt it, must re-
 “ solve to give up a great Portion of his Reputation, to
 “ be torn in pieces by the Ignorant, and by the Zealous,
 “ by some of the Learned, and by all the Envious; and
 “ they who love to Teach in quiet, being at rest in their
 “ Chairs and Pulpits, will be froward when they are
 “ awakened; and rather than they will be suspected to
 “ have taught amiss, will justify an Error, by the re-
 “ proaching of him that tells them Truth, which they are
 “ pleased to call new.

“ IF any Man differs from me in Opinion, I am not
 “ troubled at it, but tell him that Truth is in the Under-
 “ standing, and Charity is in the Will, and is or ought
 “ to be there, before either his or my Opinion in these
 “ Controversies can enter; and therefore we ought to Love
 “ alike, though we do not Understand alike: But when I
 “ find that Men are angry at my Ingenuity and Openness
 “ of Discourse, and endeavour to hinder the Event of my
 “ Labours in the Ministry of Souls, and are impatient of
 “ Contradiction or Variety of Explication, and Understand-
 “ ing of Questions; I think my self concerned to defend the
 “ Truth which I have Published, to acquit it from the
 “ Suspicion of evil Appendages, to demonstrate not only the
 “ Truth, but the Piety of it, and the Necessity, and those
 “ great Advantages which by this Doctrine so understood

“ may

D E D I C A T I O N.

“ may be reaped, if Men will be quiet and patient, void
 “ of Prejudice, and not void of Charity.

“ *THIS* (MADAM) is Reason sufficient, why I offer
 “ so many Justifications of my Doctrine, before any Man
 “ appears in Publick against it. But because there are
 “ many who do enter into the Houses of the Rich and the
 “ Honourable, and whisper secret Oppositions and Accusa-
 “ tions, rather than Arguments against my Doctrine; the
 “ good Women that are zealous for Religion, and make up
 “ in the Passions of one Faculty what is not so visible in
 “ the Actions and Operations of another, are sure to be
 “ affrighted before they be instructed; and Men enter
 “ a Caveat in that Court before they try the Cause: But
 “ that is not all; for I have found, that some Men, to
 “ whom I gave and designed my Labours, and for whose
 “ sake I was willing to suffer the Persecution of a sus-
 “ pected Truth, have been so unjust to me, and so un-
 “ serviceable to your self, (MADAM) and to some other
 “ excellent and rare Personages, as to tell Stories, and give
 “ Names to my Proposition; and by secret Murmurs hin-
 “ der you from receiving that Good, which your Wisdom
 “ and your Piety would have discerned there, if they had
 “ not affrighted you with telling, that a Snake lay under
 “ the Plantain; and that this Doctrine, which is as whole-
 “ some as the Fruits of Paradise, was enwrapped with
 “ the infolding of a Serpent, subtle and fallacious.

“ MADAM, I know the Arts of these Men; and they
 “ often put me in mind of what was told me by Mr.
 “ SACKVILL, the late Earl of DORSET's Uncle; that
 “ the cunning Sects of the World, (he named the Jesuits
 “ and the Presbyterians) did more prevail by Whispering
 “ to Ladies, than all the Church of England and the more
 “ sober Protestants could do by fine Force and Strength of
 “ Argument. For they by Prejudice or Fears, terrible
 “ Things

DEDICATION

" Things and zealous Nothings, confident Sayings and li-
 " ble Stories, governing the Ladies Consciences, who can
 " persuade their Lords, their Lords will convert their
 " Tenants, and so the World is all their own. I should
 " wish them all Good of their Profits and Purchases, if
 " the Case were otherwise than it is: But because they
 " are Questions of Souls, of their Interest and Advanta-
 " ges, I cannot wish they may prevail with the more Re-
 " ligious and Zealous Personages. And therefore (MA-
 " DAM) I have taken the Boldness to write this tedious
 " Letter to you, that I may give you a right Understand-
 " ing, and an easy Explication of this great Question, as
 " conceiving my self the more bound to do it, to your Sa-
 " tisfaction, not only because you are Zealous for the Re-
 " ligion of this Church, and are a Person of Reason as
 " well as of Religion; but also because you have passed
 " divers Obligations upon me; for which all my Services
 " are too little a Return.

F I N I S.



